



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,522	01/29/2001	Masayuki Chatani	375.12.01	9719
25920	7590	02/01/2006	EXAMINER	
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP			SWARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE				
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085			2145	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/771,522	CHATANI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,8-14 and 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,8-14 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argued Fields failed to teach manual entry of search terms. Applicant did not claim manual entry of search terms. The selection of a word in Fields was manual entry of a search term.
3. Applicant argued Fields failed to teach "the examination of attributes of the search request itself". Fields taught examination of attributes of a search request. See Fields, column 5, lines 38-50. See Fields, column 6, lines 1-24.
4. Applicant argued Fields failed to teach "ascertaining if a search result can provide information regarding any one of *when, where, why, who, what, or how* descriptive elements." In column 6, lines 20-24, Fields taught the analysis of a search result using multiple input parameters including Boolean elements. The multiple parameters including Boolean elements taught the examination of attributes of the search request itself to ascertain if the search request can provide information regarding any one of *when, where, why, who, what, or how* descriptive elements. Applicant further failed to define what the *when, where, why, who, what, or how* descriptive elements were. Pages 19-22 of the specification described use of these descriptive elements, but never explained what the descriptive elements were or how they were made up.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2145

6. Claims 1-3, 8-14, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fields.

7. In regard to claim 1, Fields disclosed *providing the search request from the client computer to the compilation server* (column 4, lines 25-28; column 5, lines 34-50); *at the compilation server, identifying prospective original content providers* (column 4, lines 26-28; column 5, lines 51-59); *at the compilation server, sending the search request to the prospective content providers* (column 4, lines 26-28; column 5, lines 60-62; column 6, lines 25-27); *receiving, by the compilation server from the network server, original server content data and original server presentation data responsive to the search request* (column 4, lines 31-33; column 6, lines 28-29); *at the compilation server, transforming the original server presentation data into transformed presentation data according to a predetermined rule* (column 4, lines 31-35; column 6, lines 7-24), *the predetermined rule being used to examine attributes of the search request itself to ascertain if the search request can provide information regarding any one of when, where, why, who, what, or how descriptive elements* (column 6, lines 7-24 where these question-based descriptive elements comprise all the data by which the elements can be arranged and modified. The responses in the search form on lines 13-14, the selected content on line 14, and the search terms and input parameters of lines 21-22 are types of descriptive elements used in arranging and modifying the data); *and at the compilation server, arranging and rendering the transformed presentation data into a unitary Web page, the unitary Web page having the transformed presentation data being output to the client computer, and integrating the descriptive elements obtained from the examination of the request itself into the unitary Web page.* (abstract; column 2, lines 8-18; column 4, lines 31-35; column 6, lines 28-29).

8. In regard to claim 2, Fields further disclosed *the step of storing the content data in the compilation server.* (column 4, lines 31-33; column 6, lines 42-43; figure 6, item 220).

9. In regard to claim 3, Fields further disclosed *the step of transforming data includes additional processing accomplished with artificial intelligence.* (column 6, lines 7-24 where artificial intelligence was provided by the syntax, templates, and logic used in processing)

Art Unit: 2145

10. In regard to claims 8-9, Fields further disclosed *the step identifying prospective content providers is accomplished either by using an acquired client profile* (column 5, lines 14-25; column 6, lines 7-24) or *based on a variable selected by the client* (column 5, lines 14-25; column 6, lines 7-24).
11. In regard to claims 10-12, Fields further disclosed *the content data is formatted into categories including an index field, a data category field, a data format field and data field* that contains *video or graphics data and sound or program data*. (figure 7; column 6, line 63 – column 7, line 6).
12. In regard to claim 13, Fields further disclosed *the receiving step comprises downloading content data over a network, and the transformed data is provided over a network*. (figure 6; abstract; column 2, lines 8-18; column 4, lines 25-28; column 6, lines 28-29)
13. In regard to claim 14, Fields further disclosed *the transformed data is provided to the client computer that generated the request*. (column 2, lines 8-18; column 4, lines 31-35; column 6, lines 28-29)
14. Claim 26 is substantially the same as claim 1.
15. Claim 27 is substantially the same as claim 9.
16. Claim 28 is substantially the same as claim 8.
17. The additional limitations of claim 29 are present in the limitations of claim 1. (column 4, lines 31-35; column 6, lines 7-24).

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
19. Teare et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624
20. Mighdoll et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,311,197
21. Jamtgaard et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624
22. Marmor U.S. Patent No. 6,601,108
23. Dodrill et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,643,621
24. Bates et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,721,781
25. Giroux et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,782,003
26. Lonnroth et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597

Art Unit: 2145

27. Li et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,854,018

28. Whittle et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595

29. Hubbard U.S. Patent No. 6,963,897

30. Bonhomme, S. et al. Interactively restructuring HTML documents. Computer Networks and ISDN Systems. Fifth International World Wide Web Conference. Paris, France. May, 1996. Vol. 28, No. 7-11, pp. 1075-1084.

31. Finkel, R.A. et al. The SUDA Project : Collaborative Web-based translation. System Sciences. Proceedings of the 32nd Annual International Conference. HICSS-32. January 1999.

32. Nakajima, Amane et al. Transformation of Web Event Sequences for Analysis of Users' Web Operation. Systems, Man, and Cybernetics. IEEE SMC '99 Conference. Volume 4. pp 111-116. October 1999.

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2145

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason Cardone
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145